

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final office action of August 4, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 18, 25, and 32 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 50-53 have been added, and claims 2, 8-12, 14-17, 20-24, 26-31, 33-41, and 43-46 have been amended. Claims 2-6, 8-17, 20-24, 26-31, 33-41, and 43-53 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, 18, 20-41, and 43-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,925,595 (*Whitledge*), in view of U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0091738 (*Rohrbaugh*). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Whitledge*, in view of *Rohrbaugh*, in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,523,040 (*Lo*).

By the present amendment, Applicant has cancelled independent claims 1, 18, 25, and 32. Claims 2, 8-12, 14-17, 20-24, 26-31, 33-41, and 43-46 have been amended to depend from one of the new claims 50-53. Thus, the current rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are believed moot. However, the references applied in the § 103 rejections will be discussed below in relation to the new claims 50-53.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 50-53 to clarify and more fully claim the invention. For example, independent claim 50 recites a method for providing device-specific content, comprising “receiving device-independent content comprising markup information identifying one or more device feature values” and “matching at least one of the device feature values ... with ... the user network terminal device.” Claim 50 further recites, “based on said matching, converting the device-independent content into device-specific content adapted to said user network terminal device.”

With regard to the *Whitledge*, as the office action correctly notes (in the discussion of claim 1), *Whitledge* does not teach content annotated with markup information corresponding to

one or more device feature values. Thus, *Whitledge* also does not teach receiving device-independent content comprising markup information identifying one or more device feature values, or matching the device feature values in the content with the features of the requesting device.

With regard to *Rohrbaugh*, which teaches creating a resolution-independent vector display of internet content, the office action states on pages 19-20, “Rohrbaugh teaches that when the web page is being rescaled according to a client’s request, the markup language is used to maintain the format the document would be in its original form ... [k]eeping the document’s original layout while changing the scale.” Although *Rohrbaugh* uses certain information in the markup language (e.g., object size, object relative location within the page) to convert the content to a vector-scalable format, *Rohrbaugh* does not teach or suggest “markup information identifying one or more device feature values,” as recited in claim 50. *Rohrbaugh* also does not teach or suggest “matching at least one of the device feature values ... with ... the user network terminal device,” as recited in claim 50. Applicant further notes that *Rohrbaugh* does not convert content into device-specific content, but rather is expressly designed to produce device-independent content (i.e., vectorized HTML content) that may be rendered on a variety of client devices. Accordingly, the combination of *Whitledge* and *Rohrbaugh*, even assuming proper, does not result in the claim 50 invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 50 is not obvious over the alleged combination of *Whitledge* and *Rohrbaugh*. Independent claims 51-53 each contain at least one similar limitation as referred to above with respect to claim 50, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 50. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-17, 20-24, 26-31, 33-41, and 43-49 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further based on the additional features recited therein.

Appln. No.: 09/881,597
Amendment dated November 1, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of August 4, 2006

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 1 day of Nov., 2006

By:


Ross A. Dannenberg
Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3160
Fax: (202) 824-3001